

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed September 11, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for One Month Extension of Time*, which extends the shortened statutory period for response to January 11, 2008. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on April 2, 2004; June 30, 2004; October 13, 2004; January 10, 2005; January 27, 2005; March 3, 2005; March 15, 2005; May 17, 2005; October 25, 2005; December 8, 2005; April 26, 2006; September 18, 2006; June 12, 2007; and June 14, 2007.

A further Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith and consideration of this Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

Claims 31-42 and 47-71 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. Claims 31-42, 47, 49-51, 53-55, 57-60, 64 and 65 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and claims 48, 52, 56, 61-63 and 66-71 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention. Accordingly, claims 48, 52, 56, 61-63 and 66-71 are now pending in the present application, of which claims 48, 52 and 56 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Despite the previous amendment to the title, paragraph 3 of the Official Action continues to object to the title as not descriptive but has not provided a specific reason as to why the title is not sufficiently descriptive. In any event, in response, the title has been further amended. Specifically, the new title is "SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE HAVING PAIR OF FLEXIBLE SUBSTRATES." The amended title is believed to be descriptive of the present invention. If the presently amended title is not sufficiently descriptive, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner further clarify why the

title is not descriptive or, if possible, suggest a title believed to be sufficiently descriptive. Reconsideration of the objection is requested.

Paragraph 4 of the Official Action rejects claims 52 and 62 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, asserting that the claims do not “comply with the written description requirement” and asserting that the “specification fails to disclose ... the following: a) channel comprises crystalline silicon (See Claim 52); and b) [a] channel comprises microcrystalline silicon (See Claim 62)” (page 2, Paper No. 20070826).

Although the applicant maintains that the specification describes a channel comprising crystalline or microcrystalline silicon at page 11, and page 12, lines 10-17, in order to advance prosecution, the Applicant has amended claims 48 (from which claim 62 depends), 52 and 56 to recite a semiconductor film comprising silicon or crystalline silicon. That is, “channel forming region” has been replaced with “semiconductor film.” The Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 48, 52 and 46 are adequately described and supported in the present specification.

Paragraph 4 of the Official Action also objects to claim 63 and raises an antecedent basis concern regarding the recitation of “the laser.” In response, the Applicant has amended claim 63 by changing “the laser comprises ...” to “the laser irradiation is conducted by using ... ,” which is in accordance with independent claim 56. Claim 56 has been amended to more clearly recite “a laser irradiation.” The Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 56 and 63 are definite.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are in order and respectfully requested.

Paragraph 7 of the Official Action rejects claims 48, 52, 56, 61, 66 and 70 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,798,744 to Tanaka, U.S. Patent No. 5,268,777 to Sato and U.S. Patent No. 5,894,151 to Yamazaki. The Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.


As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some reason, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some reason to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended. Independent claims 48, 52 and 56 have been amended to recite a resinous layer formed over one of a pair of flexible substrates, and a thin film transistor formed over the resinous layer, which is supported in the present specification, for example, by Figure 3, the pair of resinous substrates 301, 302, the resinous layer 303. The claims already recite a layer comprising resin covering the thin film transistor, which is supported in the present specification, for example, by the interlayer dielectric layer 110, which may be formed out of a resinous material. For the reasons provided below, Tanaka, Sato and Yamazaki '151, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-referenced features of the present invention.

The independent claims have been amended to clarify the positional relationship between the resinous layer, the thin film transistor and the layer comprising resin. In

other words, claims 48, 52 and 56 recite that a thin film transistor is provided between a resinous layer and a layer comprising resin.

The Official Action asserts that the TFT 101 of Tanaka corresponds with the TFT of the present claims, that the liquid crystal 200 of Tanaka corresponds to the resinous layer of the present claims, and that the protecting film 145 of Tanaka corresponds with the layer comprising resin covering the thin film transistor of the present claims (page 3, Paper No. 20070826; Figure 3 of Tanaka reproduced below).



For the sake of argument, even assuming that the liquid crystal 200 of Tanaka could somehow be equated with the "resinous layer" of the present claims, Tanaka does not teach or suggest that the thin film transistor 101 could or should be provided between the liquid crystal 200 and the protective layer 145. Therefore, Tanaka does not teach or suggest a resinous layer formed over one of a pair of flexible substrates, a thin

film transistor formed over the resinous layer, and a layer comprising resin covering the thin film transistor.

Sato and Yamazaki '151 do not cure the deficiencies in Tanaka. Sato is relied upon to allegedly teach a flexible device (Id.), and Yamazaki '151 is relied upon to allegedly teach a channel comprising silicon (page 4, Id.). However, Tanaka, Sato and Yamazaki '151, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a resinous layer formed over one of a pair of flexible substrates, a thin film transistor formed over the resinous layer, and a layer comprising resin covering the thin film transistor.

Since Tanaka, Sato and Yamazaki '151 do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.


Paragraphs 8-13 of the Official Action reject dependent claims 62, 63, 67-69 and 71 as obvious based on the combination of Tanaka, Sato, Yamazaki '151 and one of the following: U.S. Patent No. 5,712,496 to Takahashi, U.S. Patent No. 5,231,297 to Nakayama, JP 62-93974 to Tsunohashi, U.S. Patent No. 4,636,038 to Kitahara, and U.S. Patent No. 5,427,961 to Takenouchi. Although paragraph 13 refers to Takenouchi, the Official Action also appears to rely on JP 5-299653 to Hirota.

Please incorporate the arguments above with respect to the deficiencies in Tanaka, Sato and Yamazaki '151. Takahashi, Nakayama, Tsunohashi, Kitahara, Takenouchi and Hirota do not cure the deficiencies in Tanaka, Sato and Yamazaki '151. The Official Action relies on Takahashi, Nakayama, Tsunohashi, Kitahara, Takenouchi and Hirota to allegedly teach the features of the dependent claims. Specifically, the Official Action relies on Takahashi to allegedly teach microcrystalline silicon (page 8, Paper No. 20070826), on Nakayama to allegedly teach XeCl laser light (Id.), on Tsunohashi to allegedly teach a polyimide substrate (page 9, Id.), on Kitahara to allegedly teach an acrylic resin (page 10, Id.), on Takenouchi to allegedly teach a particular composition of a resinous layer (Id.), and on Hirota to allegedly teach a

coplanar thin film transistor (page 11, Id.). However, Tanaka, Sato and Yamazaki '151 and Takahashi, Nakayama, Tsunohashi, Kitahara, Takenouchi and Hirota, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the following features or that Tanaka, Sato and Yamazaki '151 should be modified to include any of the following features: a resinous layer formed over one of a pair of flexible substrates, a thin film transistor formed over the resinous layer, and a layer comprising resin covering the thin film transistor. Since Tanaka, Sato and Yamazaki '151 and Takahashi, Nakayama, Tsunohashi, Kitahara, Takenouchi and Hirota do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789